

Remarks

Claims 1-28 are pending in the present application. Claim 5 has been amended.

35 U.S.C. 112 Rejections

Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph as being indefinite. Claim 5 has been amended to correct this deficiency.

35 U.S.C. 102 Rejections

Claims 1-9, 13-21 and 23-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kamp et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,201,731), hereinafter referred to as Kamp, and Mihara et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,406,510), hereinafter referred to as Mihara. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections because the cited references do not disclose or suggest every element of any claim, as the following analysis shows.

Claim 1

Regarding Claim 1, Kamp and Mihara, whether taken alone or in combination, fails to teach “wherein the destructive read operation includes reading information from a first memory cell of a memory and wherein the write back operation includes writing the information read from the first memory cell to a second memory cell of the memory” as recited in Claim 1.

Kamp discloses a ferroelectric destructive readout memory system with a disturb prevent circuit. The office action dated December 16, 2005 indicates that Kamp

discloses the elements of Claim 1 with reference to Column 17, lines 15-19 and 28-31 of Kamp. Referring to Fig. 11 and Col 17, lines 15-31, of Kamp, data is read from one or more memory cells of array 1111 and stored in data storage device 1124 "before the cell or cells have been rewritten." Thus, Kamp discloses storing the data read in data storage device 1124 as part of a read operation and not part of a write back operation. Further, Kamp discloses rewriting the data read to the same cell location and NOT to a second cell location as part of a write back operation.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Kamp and Mihara, whether taken alone or in combination, fails to teach the limitations of Claim 1. The rejection of Claim 1 is thus unsupported, and must be withdrawn. Claims 2-9 depend from allowable Claim 1 and are allowable for at least this reason.

Claim 13

Regarding Claim 13, Kamp and Mihara, whether taken alone or in combination, fails to teach "receiving a request to write information to a first location in a polymer memory; and writing the information to a second location in the polymer memory in response to the request" as recited in Claim 13.

The office action dated December 16, 2005 has failed to indicate where in Kamp or Mihara receiving a request to write information to a first location and writing the information to a second location is disclosed. A thorough review of Kamp and Mihara reveals that this claim limitation is NOT described in either reference.

As such, Claim 13 is allowable. Claims 14-17 depend from allowable Claim 13 and is allowable for at least this reason.

Claim 18

Regarding Claim 18, Kamp and Mihara, whether taken alone or in combination, fails to teach “a memory controller coupled to the memory to perform a read cycle that includes a destructive read operation and a write back operation, wherein the destructive read operation includes reading information from a first memory cell of the memory and wherein the write back operation includes writing the information read from the first memory cell to a second memory cell of the memory” as recited in Claim 18.

As illustrated above with respect to Claim 1, Kamp and Mihara do not disclose or suggest wherein the write back operation includes writing the information read from the first memory cell to a second memory cell of the memory.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Kamp and Mihara, whether taken alone or in combination, fails to teach the limitations of Claim 18. The rejection of Claim 18 is thus unsupported, and must be withdrawn. Claims 19-20 depend from allowable Claim 18 and are allowable for at least this reason.

Claim 21

Regarding Claim 21, Kamp and Mihara, whether taken alone or in combination, fails to teach “a memory controller coupled to the memory to perform a read cycle that includes a destructive read operation and a write back operation, wherein the destructive read operation includes reading information from a first memory cell of the memory and wherein the write back operation includes writing the information read from the first memory cell to a second memory cell of the memory” as recited in Claim 21.

As illustrated above with respect to Claim 1, Kamp and Mihara do not disclose or suggest wherein the write back operation includes writing the information read from the first memory cell to a second memory cell of the memory.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Kamp and Mihara, whether taken alone or in combination, fails to teach the limitations of Claim 21. The rejection of Claim 21 is thus unsupported, and must be withdrawn. Claims 22-25 depend from allowable Claim 21 and are allowable for at least this reason.

Claim 26

Regarding Claim 26, Kamp and Mihara, whether taken alone or in combination, fails to teach "receiving a request to write information to a first location in a ferroelectric memory; and writing the information to a second location in the ferroelectric memory in response to the request" as recited in Claim 26.

The office action dated December 16, 2005 has failed to indicate where in Kamp or Mihara receiving a request to write information to a first location and writing the information to a second location is disclosed. A thorough review of Kamp and Mihara reveals that this claim limitation is NOT described in either reference.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Kamp and Mihara, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach the limitations of Claim 26. The rejection of Claim 26 is thus unsupported, and must be withdrawn. Claims 27-28 depend from allowable Claim 26 and are allowable for at least this reason.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejections

Claims 10-12 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamp in view of Rubinstein (U.S. Pat. No. 5,913,215). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections because the cited references do not disclose or suggest every element of any claim, as the following analysis shows.

Claim 10

Regarding Claim 10, Kamp and Rubinstein, whether taken alone or in combination, fails to teach "wherein the destructive read operation includes reading information from a first memory cell of a memory and wherein the write back operation includes writing the information read from the first memory cell to a second memory cell of the memory" as recited in Claim 10.

As illustrated above with respect to Claim 1, Kamp does not disclose writing the information read from the first memory cell to a second memory cell as recited by Claim 10.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Kamp and Rubenstein, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach the limitations of Claim 10. The rejection of Claim 10 is thus unsupported, and must be withdrawn. Claims 11-12 depend from allowable Claim 10 and are allowable for at least this reason.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, and indication of allowance by the Examiner is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning this application, he or she is requested to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number shown below as soon as possible. If any fee insufficiency or overpayment is found, please charge any insufficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0221.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

Date: March 15, 2006

/Rita M. Wisor / Reg. No. 41382

Rita M. Wisor
Reg. No. 41,382

Attorney Phone Number:

(512) 732-3923

Correspondence Address:

Intel Corporation
P.O. Box 5326
Santa Clara, CA 95056-5326